

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respond herein to the Office Action of March 13, 2008.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 32- 34, 36, 37 and 39, allowed Claims 7, 10 and 13-31 and indicated that Claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants amended Claims 1, 19, 20, 30-34, 36 and 37 and 39, and respectfully request a reconsideration of the rejections.

The Examiner indicated that Claims 30 and 31 do not comply with requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants amended Claims 30 and 31 to correct indicated language and respectfully submit that Claims 30 and 31 are now in compliance with requirements of §112.

Claims 32-34, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 and 112 for failure to recite a computer readable medium in the claims reciting a computer program. Applicants amended Claims 32-34, 36 and 37 to recite that the program is recorded on a computer-readable medium and is executable on a general-purpose computer. Accordingly, Claims 32-34, 36 and 37 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0036392 (“Yukie”). Claim 1, as amended, recites that the service registry shares the information autonomously with another service registry in another network control device belonging to another sub-network by transmitting this information to each other. Yukie discloses a mobile device 205 connecting to the first network 230 and the second network 235 through the first base station 220 and the second base station 225. First network 230 and second network 235 are interconnected through the network gateway 250. Network gateway 250 includes information enabling the mobile device 205 to operate on the first network 230 and on the second network 235. Thus, Yukie discloses a single network gateway having information for both networks and does not disclose or even suggest having separate gateways on each network exchanging information autonomously with each other, as required by

the amended Claim 1. Therefore, independent Claims 1 and 39 (which includes a similar limitation), as well as claims dependent on Claim 1, are allowable over the cited prior art.

It is respectfully submitted that remaining Claims 1,2, 4-7, 10, 13-27, 29-34, 36 – 37 and 39 are now in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON AUGUST 13, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Anna Vishev
Registration No.: 45,018
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700